

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

In response to the current Office Action of July 24, 2003, Applicants have corrected their previously filed amendment to comply with the voluntary revised amendment practice guidelines, published in the Official Gazette on February 25, 2003. Accordingly, Applicants have added canceled claims 1-4 to the complete listing of claims starting on page two of this paper. The following remarks/arguments are hereby resubmitted in response to the January 29, 2003 Office Action.

Claims 5-8 stand rejected. Accordingly, claim 5 has been amended, claim 6 remains unchanged and claims 7-8 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 9-20 have been added. Support for the addition of claims 9-20 are found in the specification, the claims as originally filed and in the drawings. Entry and consideration of claims 9-20 are respectfully requested. Thus, claims 5-6 and claims 9-20 are now pending in the application.

Claim 5 has been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim that which the inventors regard as the subject matter of their invention. Support for the amendment to claim 5 is found throughout the specification and particularly in FIG. 4. Entry of claim 5, as amended, and reconsideration of the rejections of the claims are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 5-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gossiau, U.S. Patent No. 1,972,441. Claim 5 has been amended to include rubber-mounted supports on which both the internal combustion engine and the generator are supported. These supports assist in dampening vibrations to prevent said vibrations from being passed from the engine to the generator. Gossiau does not teach an engine-generator arrangement supported in this manner. For the reason advanced above, Applicants submit that claim 5 defines patentably over Gossiau. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 8 have been canceled without prejudice thereby rendering the rejections thereof moot.

Claim 6 and new claims 9-20 depend from claim 5 either directly or indirectly and are allowable for the same reasons given for claim 5 and include additional limitations which are not shown or suggested by the prior art. For example, claims 9 and 15 are further patentably distinguishable from Gossiau by claiming a core. Claim 13 is further distinguishable from Gossiau by claiming a sleeve. Claim 14 is further distinguishable from Gossiau by claiming a first flange on the engine casing and a second flange on the generator casing that is arranged substantially radially coextensive with and aligned with the first flange in a substantially non-overlapping substantially parallel orientation. Gossiau does not show or suggest such a flange configuration and arrangement. In

contradistinction, Gosslau discloses an engine/generator assembly including an engine flange *superposed about* a generator flange in which the engine flange is supported on the generator flange via a plurality of rollers. As such, Gosslau discloses a non-vibration damping interface between the engine flange and generator flange.

Applicants' invention, as claimed, provides a complete vibration damping interface between the flanges. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claim 6 and allowance of claims 9-20 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, all the pending claims are considered to define patentably over the prior art. If, for any reason, the Examiner is inclined to further reject any of the claims, Applicants request that counsel be contacted to resolve any remaining issues. Reconsideration is requested and favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark D. Lorusso
Reg. No. 41,955

Dated: 25 August 2003

LORUSSO LOUD & KELLY LLP
440 Commercial Street
Boston, MA 02109
Tel.: (617) 227-0700
FAX: (617) 723-4609